DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 269 097 JC 860 246

AUTHOR Bohan, John F.; Hales, Loyde W.
TITLE Instrumental and Terminal Life Values of Part-Time and Full-Time Community College Faculty in Selected Teaching Assignments.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (70th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Measures; *College Faculty; Community Colleges; Political Attitudes; *Social Values; State Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; Two Year Colleges; *Values
IDENTIFIERS *Oregon

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to investigate the instrumental (e.g., Ambitious, Broadminded, Capable, Imaginative, Intellectual, Loving, and Responsibile) and terminal (e.g., A Comfortable Life, A Sense of Accomplishment, Equality, Health, National Security, Mature Love, and Salvation) life values of community college faculty in Oregon using the Rokeach Value Survey. A stratified (by full-/part-time teaching status and teaching assignment) proportional (by college) random sample of 984 instructors was surveyed. Study findings, based on a 51% response rate, included the following: (1) with regard to terminal values, faculty placed greater value on Health, Self-respect, Family Security, and Freedom, and less value on Salvation, Pleasure, National Security, and Social Recognition; (2) with respect to instrumental values, faculty placed greater value on Honest, Reliable, Capable, and Loving, and less value on Self-controlled, Polite, Clean, and Obedient; (3) English composition instructors placed greater value on A World of Beauty than did auto/industrial mechanic, secretarial science, and health occupations instructors; and (4) part-time social science instructors placed grater value on Courageous than did part-time health occupations instructors; and (5) males placed greater value on A Comfortable Life and An Exciting Life while females placed greater value on Self-respect and True Friendship. Based on study findings, it was concluded that community college instructors differ in life values and that these differences are related to teaching assignment and, to a lesser extent, the sex and faculty status of the instructor. (EJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. F. BOHAN

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED269097

INSTRUMENTAL AND TERMINAL LIFE VALUES OF PART-TIME AND FULL-TIME COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY IN SELECTED TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS

A paper presented at the Annual Meeting,
American Educational Research Association
San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986

by

John F. Bohan
Clackamas Community College
Oregon City, Oregon

and

Loyde W. Hales
Portland State University
Portland, Oregon

JC 860 246

INSTRUMENTAL AND TERMINAL LIFE VALUES OF PART-TIME AND FULL-TIME COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY IN SELECTED TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS

ABSTRACT

The primary objective of this study was to investigate the instrumental and terminal life values of community college faculty in Oregon using the Rokeach Value Survey. The sample used stratified (by teaching status, part-time, full-time, and teaching assignment) and proportional (by college) random sampling. The values were each used as dependent variable sets. A two-factor multivariate analysis of variance was performed on each dependent variable set, using faculty status and teaching assignment as independent variables. Other analyses were performed, also.

Conclusions on the ranking of the dependent variables showed that although there were differences in faculty status, they appeared to be of minor importance, while teaching assignment showed greater variance. Values clarification, the differences in life values across teaching fields, and the influence of values on teaching are appropriate topics for in-service educational programs for faculty.

Instrumental and Terminal Life Values of Part-Time and Full-Time Community College Faculty in Selected Teaching Assignments

John F. Bohan
Clackamas Community College

Loyde W. Hales
Portland State University

Objectives

The primary objective of this study was to investigate the instrumental and terminal values of community college faculty by teaching assignment and faculty status (part-time, full-time). It also investigated the life values of community college faculty by sex of instructor.

Perspectives

Values are basic concepts that are ingrained in each individual; an individual becomes his beliefs (values) and these beliefs serve as an explanation of why an individual responds in given ways (Combs, Hvila, & Purkey, 1971; Lepley, 1957; Rescher, 1969; Rokeach, 1960). Values begin to form early in life (Allport, 1961; Lerner, 1976), as a result of the interaction of the individual with his/her social and physical environment (Gabriel, 1974; Lerner, 1976; Rokeach, 1973). They eventually become central to other beliefs and attitudes (Bem, 1970), regulating and motivating behavior (Gabriel, 1974; Inlow, 1972; Pugh, 1977) and providing a standard that influences attitudes and actions of the individual and evaluations which the individual makes of self and others (Allport, 1961; Fenner, 1972; Pritchett, 1973; Rokeach, 1973).

Rokeach (1973) partitioned life values into 18 terminal and 18 instrumental values. Selection of the terminal list was from a pool of several hundred values obtained from the literature and from various groups; overlapping,

excessively specific, and values unrelated to the end-state of existence were eliminated. Anderson's (1968) list of 555 personality-trait words provided the item pool for the instrumental values; the pool was reduced by eliminating negative values and those which provided no discrimination across social status, sex, age, religion, etc. The respondent is to rank each list according to "guiding principles in YOUR life" (Feather, 1975, p. 27). Thus, the scales reflect the relative values of an individual and are ipsitive in nature. The test-retest reliabilities range from .51 to .88 on the terminal list and from .45 to .70 on the instrumental list. The two scales have been used in a number of studies, including studies of community colleges (Blai, 1972; Brawer, 1971; Park, 1971; Pritchett, 1973). However, none of these studies examined community college values by teaching status, teaching assignment, or sex.

Since values influence an individual's behavior and relationships with others, one should expect that the values of teachers would influence teaching style, role models provided, and relations with others. The importance of values in teaching has been discussed by Gabriel (1964), Jacob (1957), and Pullias and Young (1968).

Data Source and Methods

All community colleges in Oregon participated in this study. A stratified (by teaching status and teaching assignment) proportional (by college) random sample was use. Of the 984 instructors who received the instruments and questionnaires, 51% responded. The sample was distributed approximately equal by sex (54% male, 46% female) and by college location (metropolitan 35%, other urban 33%, small city/rural 32%). On the faculty status variable, 58% were full-time and 42% were part-time instructors. The distribution for teaching assignment was: (1) Natural Science (10%); (2) Social Science (12%); (3) Mathematics

(12%); (4) English Composition (12%); (5) Auto/Industrial Mechanics (10%); (6) Secretarial Science (9%); (7) Business Eucation (19%); and (8) Health Occupations (15%). The median age of the sample was 42.5; the median for teaching experience was 9.9 years.

The 18 terminal values and the 18 instrumental values were each used as dependent variable sets, using the ranks assigned by each respondent as variable scores. In agreement with the primary objective of this study, a two factor multivariate analysis of variance was performed on each dependent variable set, using faculty status and teaching assignment as independent variables. Two-factor univariate analyses and Scheffe's tests of pair-wise mean comparisons were performed as appropriate. Separate multivariate analyses, followed by univariate analyses and Scheffe's test, were performed on the two dependent variable sets, using sex of the instructor as the independent variable. All statistical tests except the Scheffe's were at the .05 level of significance; as recommended by Scheffe, the pair-wise mean comparisons were at the .10 level.

Results and Conclusions

The means and standard deviations of the terminal values for male and female, part-time and full-time community college faculty are presented in Tables 1 and 2. For the total faculty, the means ranged from 13.2 on Social Recognition to 5.7 for Health. In order of importance, faculty placed greater value on Health, Self-Respect, Family Security, and Freedom and less value on Salvation, Pleasure, National Security, and Social Recognition. The means and standard deviations fo the instrumental values are presented in Tables 3 and 4. For the total faculty, the means ranged from 15.1 on Obedient to 4.9 on Honest. In order of importance, faculty placed greater value on Honest, Responsible, Capable, and Loving, and less value on Self-Controlled, Polite, Clean and Obedient.

Table 1. Terminal Values Means for Community College Faculty by Faculty Status, Sex, and Total Sample

Value	Full-time	Part-time	Male	Female	Total
A Comfortable Life	11.08	11.77	11.06	12.04	11.47
An Exciting Life	10.51	10.78	10.20	11.31	10.68
A Sense of Accomplishment	8.08	7.49	7.61	7.94	7.74
A World at Peace	10.09	9.98	10.28	9.66	10.02
A World of Beauty	10.80	11.58	11.30	11.17	11.25
Equality	10.91	11.30	11.33	10.86	11.13
Family Security	6.82	6.34	6.19	6.94	6.54
Freedom	7.35	6.67	7.08	6.86	6.96
Health	6.05	5.50	5.57	5.95	5.73
Inner Harmony	7.25	7.23	7.20	7.28	7.24
Mature Love	8.38	8.71	8.76	8.27	8.57
National Security	12.48	13.61	13.35	12.87	13.13
Pleasure	12.06	12.90	12.48	12.58	12.54
Salvation	12.04	12.22	12.05	12.13	12.14
Self-Respect	6.56	5.32	6.18	5.39	5.85
Social Recognition	12.79	13.46	13.08	13.29	13.18
True Friendship	8.89	9.03	9.61	8.24	8.97
Wisdom	8.74	7.07	7.54	8.17	7.78

Table 2. Terminal Values Standard Deviations for Community College Faculty by Faculty Status, Sex, and Total Sample

Value	Full-time	Part-time	Male	Female	Total
A Comfortable Life	4.64	4.56	4.66	4.46	4.60
An Exciting Life	4.75	4.59	4.87	4.30	4.66
A Sense of Accomplishment	4.68	4.41	4.46	4.64	4.53
A World at Peace	4.91	5.24	5.10	5.10	5.10
A World of Beauty	4.31	4.14	4.60	4.08	4.22
Equality	4.64	4.33	4.60	4.31	4.46
Family Security	4.90	4.35	4.53	4.66	4.59
Freedom	4.12	4.07	4.14	4.07	4.10
Health	4.32	3.54	3.82	3.99	3.90
Inner Harmony	4.66	4.34	4.41	4.57	4.48
Mature Love	4.90	4.23	4.44	4.60	4.52
National Security	4.58	4.44	4.36	4.72	4.53
Pleasure	4.42	3.94	4.06	4.34	4.17
Salvation	6.47	6.87	6.77	6.67	6.70
Self-Respect	4.45	3.59	4.14	3.81	4.02
Social Recognition	4.21	3.54	3.79	3.90	3.85
True Friendship	4.41	4.02	4.23	4.17	4.18
Wisdom	5.34	4.33	4.79	4.91	4.58

Table 3. Instrumental Values Means for Community College Faculty by Faculty Status, Sex, and Total Sample

Value	Full-time	Part-time	Male	Female	Total
Ambitious	10.74	10.08	10.24	10.50	10.36
Broadminded	8.78	9.28	8.82	9.33	9.06
Capable	7.66	7.41	7.53	7.53	7.53
Clean	12.21	13.88	13.07	13.36	13.17
Courageous	8.84	9.29	9.14	8.99	9.10
Forgiving	9.19	9.72	9.58	9.35	9.50
Helpful	9.17	8.22	8.54	8.69	8.62
Honest	5.72	4.25	4.62	5.20	4.87
Imaginative	9.72	10.54	9.93	10.58	10.19
Independent	8.33	7.70	8.02	7.97	7.97
Intellectural	8.67	8.52	8.66	8.48	8.58
Logical	10.25	9.62	9.64	10.19	10.06
Loving	7.69	7.27	8.29	6.40	7.65
Loyal	8.78	9.74	9.81	8.76	9.50
Obedient	14.39	15.54	14.90	15.19	15.05
Polite	12.02	13.01	12.62	12.55	12.59
Responsible	7.41	5.74	6.60	6.19	6.54
Self-Controlled	11.49	11.02	10.85	11.75	11.22

Table 4. Instrumental Values Standard Deviations for Community College Faculty by Faculty Status, Sex, and Total Faculty

Value	Full-time	Part-time	Male	Female	Total
Ambitious	5.28	5.26	5.47	5.06	5.27
Broadminded	4.00	4.54	4.91	4.51	4.74
Capable	4.23	4.14	4.16	4.23	4.18
Clean	4.74	4.49	4.59	4.71	4.66
Courageous	4.53	4.61	4.64	4.54	4.58
Forgiving	4.73	4.78	4.86	4.63	4.76
Helpful	4.86	4.37	4.59	4.60	4.60
Honest	4.63	3.53	3.74	4.50	4.10
Imaginative	5.01	4.68	4.78	4.86	4.83
Independent	4.99	4.67	4.82	4.84	4.81
Intellectual	4.85	5.00	5.16	4.66	4.93
Logical	5.10	4.45	4.70	4.79	6.14
Loving	5.28	4.85	5.08	4.81	6.35
Loyal	4.74	4.38	4.52	4.57	5.84
Obedient	4.74	3.72	4.19	4.29	4.22
Polite	4.31	3.67	3.92	4.00	3.98
Responsible	4.48	3.77	4.27	3.99	4.17
Self-Controlled	4.62	4.72	4.85	4.36	4.68

In general, these results were similar to those of Blai (1972), Brawer (1971), Park (1971), and Pritchett (1973). However, it was interesting to discover that the respondents in this study placed greater value on Family Security and less value on Sense of Accomplishment than did the respondents in earlier studies.

A multivariate, two-factor, analysis of variance was performed on the terminal values, using faculty status and teaching assignment as independent variables. The statistical hypothesis for interaction in the MANOVA was rejected (with 126, 3057.5 df, the Wilks' lambda $F = 1.31$; $p < .013$). Consequently, the univariate analyses were examined for interaction (see Table 5). A significant interaction was found on three values: Inner Harmony ($F = 2.26$; $p < .03$); National Security ($F = 2.60$; $p < .01$); and Pleasure ($F = 2.59$; $p < .01$). Insubsequent analyses of these variables, differences by teaching status were separately analyzed for part-time and full-time faculty.

Table 5. Univariate Analyses of Variance of Terminal Values for the Interation Effect of Faculty Status and Teaching Assignment

Terminal Value	Sums of Squares		Mean Square		F	p
	Hypothesis	Error	Hypothesis	Error		
A Comfortable Life	30.05	10071.19	4.29	20.94	0.21	.984
An Exciting Life	69.58	10321.52	9.94	21.46	0.46	.861
A Sense of Accomplishment	82.75	9897.57	11.82	20.58	0.57	.777
A World at Peace	270.87	12397.91	38.70	25.78	1.50	.164
A World of Beauty	162.30	7962.64	23.19	16.55	1.40	.203
Equality	92.85	9445.29	13.26	19.64	0.68	.693
Family Security	205.36	9747.24	29.34	20.26	1.45	.184
Freedom	20.45	7975.95	2.92	16.58	0.18	.990
Health	101.42	6982.20	14.63	14.52	1.01	.425
Inner Harmony	312.23	9478.20	44.60	19.71	2.26	.028
Mature Love	217.59	9865.14	31.08	20.51	1.52	.160
National Security	337.07	8908.72	48.15	18.52	2.60	.012
Pleasure	308.30	8193.22	44.04	17.03	2.59	.013
Salvation	269.08	21350.15	38.44	44.39	0.87	.533
Self Respect	210.32	7349.87	30.05	15.28	1.97	.058
Social Recognition	157.25	7037.65	22.46	14.63	1.54	.153
True Friendship	80.67	8451.58	11.52	17.57	0.66	.709
Wisdom	147.08	10931.91	21.01	22.73	0.92	.487

df = 7, 481

The statistical hypothesis for faculty status, in the two-factor MANOVA of terminal values, was rejected (with 18, 464 df, the Wilks' lambda F = 2.75; p < .001). Therefore, the univariate analyses were examined for the terminal values (see Table 6). Significant differences were found in four values:

Table 6. Univariate Analyses of Variance of Terminal Values for the Faculty Status Main Effect

Terminal Value	Sums of Squares		Mean Square		F	p
	Hypothesis	Error	Hypothesis	Error		
A Comfortable Life	53.58	10071.19	53.58	20.94	2.56	.110
An Exciting Life	8.19	10321.52	8.19	21.46	0.38	.537
A Sense of Accomplishment	37.11	9897.57	37.11	20.58	1.80	.180
A World at Peace	4.16	12397.91	4.16	25.78	0.16	.688
A World of Beauty	62.17	7962.64	62.17	16.55	3.76	.053
Equality	12.14	9445.29	12.14	19.64	0.62	.432
Family Security	25.12	9747.24	25.12	20.26	1.24	.266
Freedom	60.32	7975.95	60.32	16.58	3.64	.057
Health	22.92	6982.20	22.92	14.52	1.58	.210
Inner Harmony	0.63	9478.20	0.63	19.71	0.03	.859
Mature Love	13.12	9865.14	13.12	20.51	0.64	.424
National Security	156.58	8908.72	156.58	18.52	8.45	.004
Pleasure	86.71	8193.22	86.71	17.03	5.09	.025
Salvation	5.61	21350.15	5.61	44.39	0.13	.722
Self-Respect	183.60	7349.87	183.60	15.28	12.02	.001
Social Recognition	43.43	7037.65	43.43	14.63	2.97	.086
True Friendship	3.16	8451.58	3.16	17.57	0.18	.672
Wisdom	331.51	10931.91	331.51	22.73	14.59	.001

df = 1, 481

National Security (F = 8.45; p < .004); Pleasure (F = 5.09; p < .025); Self-Respect (F = 12.02; p < .001); and Wisdom (F = 14.59; p < .001). Full-time faculty placed less value than did part-time faculty on Self-Respect and Wisdom. Because of the significant interaction on National Security, the main effects for these variables were not interpreted.

The statistical hypothesis for the teaching assignment main effect in the two-factor MANOVA of terminal values was rejected (with 126, 3057.5 df, the Wilks' lambda F = 1.84; p < .001). Consequently, the univariate analyses of terminal values for this effect were examined (see Table 7). Significant

differences were found for 10 values: A Comfortable Life ($F = 2.44$; $p < .018$); AnExciting Life ($F = 2.25$; $p < .029$); A World of Beauty ($F = 5.64$; $p < .001$); Equality ($F = 2.33$; $p < .024$); Family Security ($F = 3.33$; $p < .002$); Freedom ($F = 2.39$; $p < .021$); Health ($F = 4.31$; $p < .001$); National Security ($F = 6.06$; $p < .001$); Salvation ($F = 2.20$; $p < .033$); and Self-Respect ($F = 2.70$; $p < .009$).

Table 7. Univariate Analyses of Variance of Terminal Values for the Teaching Assignment Main Effect

Terminal Value	Sum of Squares		Mean Square		F	p
	Hypothesis	Error	Hypothesis	Error		
A Comfortable Life	357.12	10071.19	51.02	20.94	2.44	.018
An Exciting Life	338.63	10321.52	48.38	21.46	2.25	.029
A Sense of Accomplishment	174.63	9897.57	24.95	20.58	1.21	.294
A World at Peace	227.82	12397.91	32.55	25.78	1.26	.267
A World of Beauty	653.95	7962.64	93.42	16.55	5.64	.001
Equality	320.22	9445.29	45.75	19.64	2.33	.024
Family Security	471.69	9747.24	67.38	20.26	3.33	.002
Freedom	277.70	7975.95	39.67	16.58	2.39	.021
Health	437.70	6982.20	62.53	14.52	4.31	.001
Inner Harmony	126.99	9478.20	18.14	19.71	0.92	.490
Mature Love	53.42	9865.14	7.63	20.51	0.37	.919
National Security	786.13	8908.72	112.30	18.52	6.06	.001
Pleasure	43.10	8193.22	6.16	17.03	0.36	.924
Salvation	684.73	21350.15	97.82	44.39	2.20	.033
Self-Respect	288.59	7349.87	41.23	15.28	2.70	.009
Social Recognition	115.38	7037.65	16.48	14.63	1.13	.345
True Friendship	164.20	8451.58	23.46	17.57	1.33	.232
Wisdom	268.26	10931.91	38.32	22.73	1.69	.110

$df = 7, 481$

With the exception of National Security, which was excluded because of the significant interaction, a Scheffé's test was performed on each pair-wise mean comparison for each significant terminal value, using a .10 level of significance for each comparison. Group means and standard deviations are presented in Tables 8 and 9, respectively. A summary of significant pair-wise mean comparisons is found in Table 10. English Composition instructors placed greater value on A World of Beauty than did Auto/Industrial Mechanic, Secre-

Table 8. Scale Means for Terminal Values by Levels of Teaching Teaching Assignment

RVS Scale	NatSci (1)	SocSci (2)	Mth (3)	Eng (4)	A/IndM (5)	BusEd (6)	SecSci (7)	Hlth (8)
A Comfortable Life	12.08	12.11	10.72	12.90	10.28	11.17	10.66	12.00
An Exciting Life	9.76	9.60	10.92	9.75	11.22	12.19	10.76	11.46
A Sense of Accomp	6.90	6.95	8.20	7.47	7.46	7.47	8.57	8.17
A World at Peace	11.02	9.95	9.82	8.50	10.52	9.75	10.50	10.07
A World of Beauty	11.04	9.87	11.31	9.05	12.42	11.13	12.25	12.29
Equality	11.32	10.29	10.85	9.73	12.50	11.89	11.70	10.96
Family Security	7.06	8.23	6.05	7.88	5.42	6.15	5.58	6.32
Freedom	6.51	5.66	7.02	6.67	8.44	7.62	6.69	7.49
Health	4.98	7.32	6.07	7.03	5.02	5.70	5.32	4.57
Inner Harmony	6.90	8.42	7.43	6.90	7.02	6.53	7.26	7.26
Mature Love	8.27	8.76	8.05	8.75	8.84	9.09	8.75	8.22
National Security	15.04	13.77	13.69	14.45	11.02	11.09	12.50	13.30
Pleasure	12.43	12.42	12.59	12.72	12.84	12.34	12.11	13.00
Salvation	13.25	13.39	12.12	14.23	11.12	11.02	10.92	11.65
Self-Respect	5.18	5.77	5.80	6.08	6.50	6.68	6.55	4.38
Social Recognition	14.20	12.40	13.00	12.98	12.72	13.19	13.40	13.49
True Friendship	8.43	9.11	8.69	8.78	9.36	8.85	9.96	8.21
Wisdom	6.78	6.97	8.30	7.12	8.48	9.23	7.55	8.08

Table 9. Scale Standard Deviations for Terminal Values by for Levels of Teaching Assignment

RVS Scale	NatSci (1)	SocSci (2)	Mth (3)	Eng (4)	A/IndM (5)	BusEd (6)	SecSci (7)	Hlth (8)
A Comfortable Life	3.22	4.65	4.72	4.58	5.40	4.92	4.46	4.34
An Exciting Life	4.30	4.41	4.76	4.42	5.43	4.28	4.85	4.30
A Sense of Accomp	4.57	3.46	5.14	4.44	4.41	4.65	4.75	4.53
A World at Peace	4.57	5.49	4.97	4.72	5.22	5.50	5.24	4.92
A World of Beauty	4.50	4.64	3.96	4.14	3.74	4.46	3.98	3.50
Equality	4.05	5.05	4.19	4.41	4.06	4.15	4.83	4.13
Family Security	4.92	4.89	4.56	4.69	4.19	5.00	3.40	4.24
Freedom	3.61	3.98	3.91	3.85	3.93	4.71	4.13	4.22
Health	3.22	3.64	4.32	3.76	4.10	3.92	3.54	3.96
Inner Harmony	4.48	4.76	4.57	4.76	4.07	4.03	4.16	4.79
Mature Love	4.71	4.33	4.79	4.46	4.61	4.71	4.46	4.42
National Security	3.04	4.55	4.00	4.49	4.47	5.06	4.61	4.40
Pleasure	4.25	4.26	4.08	3.93	3.72	4.40	4.62	4.00
Salvation	6.97	6.42	6.67	5.30	6.55	6.70	7.01	7.12
Self-Respect	3.30	3.40	4.26	4.47	4.52	4.64	4.35	2.67
Social Recognition	2.86	4.16	3.80	4.58	4.75	3.38	3.40	3.67
True Friendship	3.85	4.45	4.35	4.25	3.82	4.71	4.16	3.83
Wisdom	4.28	5.42	4.91	5.22	4.92	4.42	4.94	4.29

Table 10. Significant Pair-Wise Mean Comparisons between Levels of Teaching Assignment on the Terminal Values

Terminal Scale	Pair-Wise Group Comparisons			
A World of Beauty	2-7*	4-5**	4-7**	4-8**
Family Security	2-7*			
Freedom	2-5*			
Health	2-8*	4-8*		
Self-Respect	7-8*			

Natural Science (1); Social Science (2); Mathematics (3); English (4); Auto/Industrial Mechanics (5); Business Education (6); Secretarial Science (7); and Health (8)
* alpha = .10
** alpha = .05

tarial Science, and Health Occupations instructors. Social Science instructors also placed greater value on A World of Beauty than did Secretarial Science instructors. Secretarial Science instructors placed greater value on Family Security than did Social Science instructors. Social Science instructors placed greater value on Freedom than did Auto/Industrial Mechanic instructors. Health Occupations instructors placed greater value on Health than did Social Science and English Composition instructors. Health Occupations intructors placed greater value on Self-Respect than did Secretarial Science instructors.

A multivariate, two-factor analysis of variance was performed on instrumental values, using faculty status and teaching assignment as independent variables. The statistical hypothesis for interaction in the MANOVA was rejected (with 126, 3050.94 df, Wilks' lambda $F = 1.23$; $p < .047$). Therefore, the univariate analyses were examined for interaction (see Table 11). A significant interaction was found on only one variable: Courageous ($F = 2.15$; $p < .04$).

The statistical hypothesis for faculty status, in the two-factor MANOVA of instrumental values, was rejected (with 18, 463 df, the Wilks' lambda $F = 4.36$; $p < .001$). Therefore, the univariate analyses were examined for the instrumental values (see Table 12). Significant differences were found on six variables.

Table 11. Univariate Analyses of Variance of Instrumental Values for the Interaction Effect of Faculty Status and Teaching Assignment

Terminal Value	Sums of Squares		Mean Square		F	p
	Hypothesis	Error	Hypothesis	Error		
Ambitious	177.52	13144.12	25.36	27.38	0.93	.49
Broadminded	105.71	10644.83	15.10	22.18	0.68	.69
Capable	210.71	8251.79	30.10	17.19	1.75	.10
Clean	134.55	9450.02	19.22	19.69	0.98	.45
Courageous	300.05	9560.22	42.86	19.92	2.15	.04
Forgiving	179.30	10898.08	25.61	22.70	1.13	.34
Helpful	62.10	10159.26	8.87	21.17	0.42	.89
Honest	202.74	7640.04	28.96	15.92	1.82	.08
Imaginative	178.88	10835.47	25.55	22.57	1.13	.34
Independent	145.40	10848.79	20.77	22.60	0.92	.49
Intellectual	195.23	10957.56	27.89	22.83	1.22	.29
Logical	275.74	18090.97	39.39	37.69	1.05	.40
Loving	169.53	19029.71	24.22	39.65	0.61	.75
Loyal	191.65	15900.45	27.38	33.13	0.83	.57
Obedient	165.22	8073.30	23.60	16.82	1.40	.20
Polite	62.87	7526.49	8.98	15.68	0.57	.78
Responsible	188.20	7658.43	26.89	15.96	1.69	.11
Self-Controlled	114.81	10475.45	16.40	21.82	0.75	.63

df = 7, 480

Table 12. Univariate Analyses of Variance of Instrumental Values for the Faculty Status Main Effect

Terminal Value	Sum of Squares		Mean Square		F	p
	Hypothesis	Error	Hypothesis	Error		
Ambitious	39.00	13144.12	39.00	27.38	1.42	.233
Broadminded	19.70	10644.83	19.70	22.18	0.89	.346
Capable	4.79	8251.79	4.79	17.19	0.28	.598
Clean	354.48	9450.02	354.48	19.69	18.00	.001
Courageous	12.12	9560.22	12.12	19.92	0.61	.436
Forgiving	33.99	10898.08	33.99	22.70	1.50	.222
Helpful	105.63	10159.26	105.63	21.17	4.99	.026
Honest	223.68	7640.04	223.68	15.92	14.05	.001
Imaginative	70.76	10835.47	70.76	22.57	3.13	.077
Independent	49.58	10848.79	49.58	22.60	2.19	.139
Intellectual	7.69	10957.56	7.69	22.83	0.34	.562
Logical	128.45	18090.97	128.45	37.69	3.41	.065
Loving	95.51	19029.71	95.51	39.65	2.41	.121
Loyal	66.77	15900.45	66.77	33.13	2.02	.156
Obedient	174.73	8073.30	174.73	16.82	10.39	.001
Polite	129.94	7526.49	129.94	15.68	8.29	.004
Responsible	295.09	7658.43	295.09	15.96	18.50	.001
Self-Controlled	19.86	10475.45	19.86	21.82	0.91	.341

df = 1, 480

Full-time faculty placed greater value on Clean (F = 18.00; p < .001), Polite (F = 8.29; p < .004), and Obedient (F = 10.39; p < .001), and less value on Honest (F = 14.05; p < .001), Helpful (F = 4.99; p < .026), and Responsible (F = 18.50; p < .001) than did part-time faculty.

The statistical hypothesis for the teaching assignment main effect in the two factor MANOVA of instrumental values was rejected (with 126, 3050.94 df, the Wilks' lambda F = 2.02; p < .001). Consequently, the univariate analyses of instrumental values for this effect were examined (see Table 13). Significant

Table 13. Univariate Analyses of Variance of Instrumental Values for the Teaching Assignment Main Effect

Instrumental Value	Sums of Squares		Mean Square		F	p
	Hypothesis	Error	Hypothesis	Error		
Ambitious	410.30	13144.12	58.61	27.38	2.14	.038
Broadminded	377.15	10644.83	53.88	22.18	2.43	.019
Capable	186.43	8251.79	26.63	17.19	1.55	.149
Clean	826.73	9450.02	118.10	19.69	6.00	.001
Courageous	493.71	9560.22	70.53	19.92	3.54	.001
Forgiving	98.63	10898.08	14.09	22.70	0.62	.739
Helpful	115.27	10159.26	16.47	21.17	0.78	.606
Honest	244.29	7640.04	34.90	15.92	2.19	.034
Imaginative	504.93	10835.47	72.13	22.57	3.20	.003
Independent	430.10	10848.79	61.44	22.60	2.72	.009
Intellectual	870.87	10957.56	124.41	22.83	5.45	.001
Logical	211.36	10890.97	30.19	37.69	0.80	.587
Loving	691.65	19029.71	98.81	39.65	2.49	.016
Loyal	735.09	15900.45	105.01	33.13	3.17	.003
Obedient	396.94	8073.30	56.71	16.82	3.37	.002
Polite	134.80	7526.49	19.26	15.68	1.23	.285
Responsible	475.29	7658.43	67.90	15.96	4.26	.001
Self-Controlled	228.75	10475.45	32.68	21.82	1.50	.166

df = 7, 480

differences were found on 12 values: Ambitious (F = 2.14; p < .038); Broadminded (F = 2.43; p < .019); Clean (F = 6.00; p < .001); Courageous (F = 3.54; p < .001); Honest (F = 2.19; p < .034); Imaginative (F = 3.20; p < .003);

Independent (F = 2.72; p < .009); Intellectual (F = 5.45; p < .001); Loving (F = 2.49; p < .016); Loyal (F = 3.17; p < .003); Obedient (F = 3.37; p <.002); and Responsible (F = 4.26; p < .001).

With the exception of Courageous, which was excluded because of significant interaction, Scheffe's test was performed on each pair-wise mean comparison for each significant instrumental value. Group means and standard deviations are presented in Tables 14 and 15. A summary of significant pair-wise mean comparisons is found in Table 16. Auto/Industrial Mechanics instructors placed greater value on Clean than did Natural Science, Social Science, English Compostion, and Secretarial Science instructors. Business Education instructors placed greater value on Clean than did English instructors. English instructors placed greater value on Imaginative than did Auto/Industrial Mechanics and Secretarial Science instructors. Social Science and English instructors placed greater value on

Table 14. Scale Means for Instrumental Values by Levels of Teaching Assignment

Scale	NatSci (1)	SocSci (2)	Mth (3)	Eng (4)	A/IndM (5)	BusEd (6)	SecSci (7)	Hlth (8)
Ambitious	10.53	11.52	10.73	11.22	8.16	9.60	10.47	10.16
Broadminded	9.18	7.44	8.70	8.27	10.06	10.53	9.38	9.34
Capable	7.25	7.74	7.82	8.37	7.30	8.64	6.84	6.92
Clean	13.94	13.73	13.12	15.30	10.24	11.96	13.40	12.97
Courageous	9.35	7.58	8.58	7.50	9.50	10.00	9.69	10.25
Forgiving	9.96	9.94	9.55	9.40	8.78	9.32	8.99	10.07
Helpful	8.92	8.48	9.33	8.25	8.98	7.47	8.77	8.59
Honest	4.25	5.94	9.47	5.33	4.58	5.64	4.38	3.93
Imaginative	10.35	9.03	10.23	8.12	11.32	10.96	11.04	10.42
Independent	7.29	8.37	6.88	7.13	9.94	7.77	8.85	7.53
Intellectual	8.61	6.81	8.32	6.75	11.42	8.94	9.39	8.70
Logical	9.08	9.45	9.90	10.70	10.38	11.55	9.82	10.04
Loving	8.37	6.92	9.22	6.03	9.30	6.21	8.29	6.78
Loyal	9.67	10.10	11.77	9.08	9.78	7.06	8.51	10.01
Obedient	15.20	15.50	15.10	15.88	13.04	14.09	14.83	16.15
Polite	12.80	13.23	12.83	12.88	11.44	12.83	12.04	12.78
Responsible	5.88	7.68	6.90	8.12	6.56	6.40	5.52	5.26
Self-Controlled	10.31	11.57	10.97	12.42	10.48	12.28	10.89	11.11

Table 15. Scale Standard Deviations for Instrumental Values by Levels of Teaching Assignment

RVS Scale	NatSci (1)	SocSci (2)	Mth (3)	Eng (4)	A/IndM (5)	BusEd (6)	SecSci (7)	Hlth (8)
Ambitious	5.52	5.14	5.72	4.56	5.47	5.14	5.14	5.22
Broadminded	4.77	4.84	4.94	4.32	5.30	4.46	4.61	4.45
Capable	4.10	3.77	3.98	4.16	4.33	4.85	4.37	3.83
Clean	4.31	4.09	4.40	3.56	4.74	5.03	4.83	4.84
Courageous	4.30	4.34	4.72	4.03	5.12	4.65	4.46	4.44
Forgiving	4.90	4.84	4.91	5.01	4.73	4.95	4.54	4.51
Helpful	4.54	4.37	4.66	4.36	5.01	4.62	4.63	4.64
Honest	3.06	4.02	4.78	4.35	4.15	4.69	3.84	3.60
Imaginative	4.94	4.86	4.39	5.47	4.62	4.30	4.69	4.73
Independent	4.70	4.75	4.65	4.58	4.75	5.05	4.86	4.72
Intellectual	4.73	4.90	4.49	4.91	4.89	4.49	4.88	4.84
Logical	4.27	5.17	4.39	4.72	4.94	4.17	4.72	4.63
Loving	5.20	5.20	4.19	3.55	5.03	4.90	5.51	4.81
Loyal	4.83	4.32	4.42	4.12	5.10	4.69	4.42	3.90
Obedient	3.47	4.31	4.18	3.43	5.10	4.70	4.26	3.73
Polite	4.18	3.97	3.54	3.83	4.29	4.23	3.99	3.90
Responsible	4.24	3.97	4.59	4.08	4.64	4.27	3.71	3.57
Self-Controlled	5.12	4.41	4.65	4.10	5.25	4.47	4.89	4.40

Table 16. Significant Pair-Wise mean Comparisons between Levels of Teaching Assignment on the Instrumental Values

Instrumental Scale	Pair-Wise Group Comparisons[a]				
Clean	5-1**	5-2**	5-4**	5-7**	4-6**
Imaginative	4-5*	4-7*			
Intellectual	2-5**	4-5**			
Loyal	3-6**				
Obedient	5-4*	5-8**			
Responsible	4-7**	2-8*	4-8**		

* alpha = .10
** alpha = .05
[a]Natural Science (1); Social Science (2); Mathematics (3); English (4); Auto/Industrial Mechanics (5); Business Education (6); Secretarial Science (7); and Health (8)

Intellectual than did Auto/Industrial Mechanics instructors. Business Education instructors placed greater value on Loyal than did Mathematics instructors. Auto/Industrial Mechanics instructors placed greater value on Obedient than did English and Health instructors. Secretarial Science and Health instructors placed greater value on Responsible than did English instructors. Health instructors placed greater value on Responsible than did Social Science instructors.

Four life values had significant interactions: Courageous, Harmony, National Security, and Pleasure. For these values, teaching assignment differences were examined separately for part-time and full-time faculty. (See Table 17.) Significant differences were found on Courageous for Part-time (F = 3.54; $p < .001$) and Full-time (F = 2.31; $p < .032$) faculty and on National Security for Full-time faculty (F = 7.06; $p < .001$). Therefore, Scheffe's test was performed on each pair-wise mean comparison. (Means and standard deviations for teaching

Table 17. Univariate One-Way Analyses of Variance of Terminal and Instrumental Values which had Significant Interaction, Examining the Teaching Assignment Main Effect

Value	Sums of Squares		Mean Square		F	p
	Hypothesis	Error	Hypothesis	Error		
PART-TIME*						
Courageous	467.94	3832.58	66.85	18.88	3.54	.001
Harmony	288.56	4279.12	41.22	21.08	1.96	.063
National Security	277.15	4135.54	39.59	20.37	1.94	.065
Pleasure	231.52	3884.68	33.07	19.14	1.73	.104
FULL-TIME**						
Courageous	322.16	5734.33	46.02	20.63	2.31	.032
Harmony	151.29	5199.08	21.61	18.70	1.16	.329
National Security	848.96	4773.18	121.28	17.17	7.06	.001
Pleasure	121.52	4308.54	17.36	14.50	1.12	.350

*df = 7, 203
**df = 7, 278

assignment groups with faculty status are shown in Table 18.) Part-time Social Science instructors placed greater value on Courageous than did part-time Health Occupations instructors. Auto/Industrial Mechanics and Business Education full-time instructors placed greater value on National Security than did Natural Science, Mathematics, and English full-time instructors. Also, full-time Secretarial Science instructors placed greater value on National Security than did English full-time instructors. (See Table 19.)

Table 18. Means and Standard Deviations of Those Values with Significant Interactions by Teaching Assignment with Faculty Status

Value	Teaching Assignment							
	NatSci (1)	SocSci (2)	Mth (3)	Eng (4)	A/IndM (5)	BusEd (6)	SecSci (7)	Hlth (8)
PART-TIME								
Courageous								
Mean	10.60	6.97	7.97	7.85	7.90	10.32	8.68	11.42
S.D.	3.83	4.52	5.15	3.63	4.84	4.06	4.34	3.85
Harmony								
Mean	7.80	8.30	8.59	6.00	5.40	5.53	7.03	8.16
S.D.	4.60	4.50	4.85	4.95	3.60	4.45	4.02	5.34
National Security								
Mean	18.87	13.87	12.16	11.96	10.65	10.84	12.87	12.48
S.D.	3.81	4.69	4.06	5.33	4.86	4.82	4.38	4.07
Pleasure								
Mean	12.67	11.50	12.31	13.27	14.15	10.21	11.32	11.74
S.D.	2.85	4.70	4.67	4.15	3.17	5.00	4.57	4.50
FULL-TIME								
Courageous								
Mean	8.79	8.16	9.29	7.24	10.57	9.79	10.44	9.44
S.D.	4.44	4.14	4.16	4.34	5.10	5.07	4.41	4.67
Harmony								
Mean	6.50	8.53	6.14	7.59	8.10	7.21	7.43	6.64
S.D.	4.43	5.06	3.93	4.57	4.06	3.63	4.29	4.32
National Security								
Mean	15.12	13.69	15.38	16.35	11.27	11.25	12.24	13.87
S.D.	2.69	4.49	3.21	2.42	4.27	5.30	4.79	4.58
Pleasure								
Mean	12.32	13.28	12.90	12.29	11.97	13.79	12.67	13.87
S.D.	4.78	3.67	3.37	3.75	3.86	3.29	4.61	3.40

Table 19. Significant Pair-wise mean Comparisons Between Levels of Teaching Assignment Within Levels of Faculty Status

Scale	Faculty Status	Pair-Wise Group Comparisons[a]
Courageous	Part-time	2-8**
National Security	Full-time	1-5* 1-6* 3-5** 3-6* 4-5** 4-6** 4-7**

* alpha = .10
** alpha = .05

Using sex of instructor as the independent variable, the statistical hypothesis for the MANOVA for terminal values was rejected (Wilk's lambda $F = 2.39$; $p < .001$). Therefore, the univariate analyses were examined for terminal values. See Table 20. (Means and standard deviations were presented in Tables 1 and 2). Significant differences were found on four of the resulting ANOVAs. Males placed greater value on A Comfortable Life ($F = 5.61$; $p < .02$) and An Exciting Life ($F = 6.30$; $p < .02$), and females placed greater value on Self-Respect ($F = 4.89$; $p < .03$) and True Friendship ($F = 13.50$; $p < .001$).

For instrumental values, the statistical hypothesis for the MANOVA was rejected (Wilks' lambda $F = 2.09$; $p < .01$). Therefore, the univariate analyses for instrumental values were examined, using sex of instructor as the independent variable. See Table 21. (Means and standard deviations were presented in Tables 3 and 4.) Significant differences were found on three of the ANOVAS. Females placed greater value on Loving ($F = 15.45$; $p < .001$) and Loyal ($F = 6.81$; $p < .01$) and males placed greater value on Self-Control ($F = 4.32$; $p < .04$).

Values are an important part of personality, playing an important role in directing an individual's behavior, structuring his/her interpersonal relationships, and providing a standard for the evaluation of self and others. Therefore, one could expect that the life values of an instructor will influence

Table 20. Univariate Analyses of Variance of Terminal Values for the Sex Main Effect

Terminal Value	Sums of Squares		Mean Square		F	p
	Hypothesis	Error	Hypothesis	Error		
A Comfortable Life	117.01	10199.68	117.01	20.86	5.61	.018
An Exciting Life	134.48	10434.20	134.48	21.34	6.30	.012
A Sense of Accomplishment	12.18	10102.27	12.18	20.66	0.59	.443
A World at Peace	46.98	12707.97	46.98	25.99	1.81	.179
A World of Beauty	1.92	8767.72	1.92	17.93	0.11	.743
Equality	26.93	9767.91	26.93	19.98	1.35	.246
Family Security	70.00	10316.19	70.00	21.10	2.22	.069
Freedom	6.57	8257.30	6.57	16.89	0.39	.533
Health	18.46	7431.69	18.46	15.20	1.22	.271
Inner Harmony	0.39	9798.29	0.39	20.04	0.02	.889
Mature Love	30.40	9983.41	30.40	20.42	1.49	.223
National Security	27.58	10027.34	27.58	20.51	1.35	.246
Pleasure	1.44	8584.99	1.44	17.56	0.08	.775
Salvation	0.71	22172.17	0.71	45.34	0.12	.901
Self Respect	77.93	7786.30	77.93	15.92	4.89	.027
Social Recognition	5.33	7216.90	5.33	14.76	0.36	.548
True Friendship	232.27	8415.60	232.27	17.21	13.50	.001
Wisdom	49.35	11495.59	49.35	23.51	2.10	.148

df = 1, 488

Table 21. Univariate Analyses of Variance of Instrumental Values for the Sex Main Effect

Instrumental Value	Sums of Squares		Mean Square		F	p
	Hypothesis	Error	Hypothesis	Error		
Ambitious	7.61	13644.00	7.61	27.96	0.27	.602
Broadminded	31.74	10920.43	31.74	22.38	1.42	.234
Capable	0.03	8607.74	0.03	17.64	0.00	.970
Clean	9.99	10547.60	9.99	21.61	0.46	.497
Courageous	2.20	1307.08	2.20	21.12	0.14	.747
Forgiving	6.91	11025.25	6.91	22.59	0.31	.581
Helpful	2.55	10245.77	2.55	21.00	0.12	.727
Honest	37.96	8246.53	37.96	16.90	2.25	.135
Imaginative	50.51	11338.97	50.51	23.24	2.17	.141
Independent	0.80	11393.17	0.80	23.35	0.03	.854
Intellectual	5.03	11855.34	5.03	24.29	0.21	.649
Logical	5.33	18581.74	5.33	38.08	0.14	.708
Loving	609.60	19257.17	609.60	39.46	15.45	.001
Loyal	231.58	16592.91	231.58	34.00	6.81	.009
Obedient	8.82	8764.36	8.82	17.96	0.49	.484
Polite	0.63	7653.74	0.63	15.68	0.04	.841
Responsible	22.61	8410.94	22.61	17.24	1.31	.253
Self-Controlled	92.75	10471.50	92.75	21.46	4.32	.038

df = 1, 488

his/her role modeling, teaching style, and relationships with students. This study confirms that community college instructors differ in life values and that these differences are related to teaching assignment and, to a lesser extent, to the sex and faculty status of the instructor. For an understanding of the terminal and instrumental values of community college faculty, teaching assignment is an important variable and should be considered in inservice programs aimed at value clarification and understanding of the role of values in teaching.

However, the differences which can be attributed to faculty status appear to be minor and this variable is likely to contribute little to an understanding of values. Similarly, differences between male and female faculty members were relatively minor, suggesting that this variable is of little importance in understanding the life values of community college faculty. Nevertheless, because sex differences are found in the life values of the general population, one might wish to include sex differences in an inservice program aimed at values clarification and values in teaching.

In conclusion, in order to provide a supportive environment for community college students, faculty need to be cognizant of their life values and how their values may influence their teaching and relationships with students. Thus, values clarification, the differences in life values across teaching fields, and the influence of values on teaching are appropriate topics for inservice educational program for faculty. In addition, one might suspect that values clarification would be beneficial for students, perhaps included in an occupational/careers orientation program.

References

Allport, G. W. (1961) Pattern and growth in personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Anderson, N. (1968) Likeableness ratings of 555 personality trait words. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 9, 272-279.

Bem, J. (1970) Beliefs, attitudes and human values. Belmont, CA: Brooks-Cole Publishing Co.

Blai, B. (1972, May) Value and perceptions of a private junior college faculty: Public community college faculties and students. Bryn Mawr, PA: Harcum Junior College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 061 945)

Brawer, F. B. (1971, June) Values and generation gap: Junior college freshmen and faculty. (ERIC Clearinghouse of Junior College Information, ED 050 724)

Combs, A. W., Hvila, D. L., & Purkey, W. W. (1971) Helping relationships. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Feather, N. T. (1975) Values in education and society. New York: The Free Press.

Fenner, B. J. (1972) The development of the Ohio Work Values Inventory: An investigation of internal characteristics (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio University). Dissertation Abstracts International (University Microfilms No. 81-09166), 33 (04A), 1433.

Gabriel, J. (1968) Children growing up. New York: American Elsevier Publishing Co.

Gabriel, R. (1974) American values. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.

Inlow, G. M. (1972) Values in transition. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Jacob. P. E. (1957) Changing values in college. New York: Harper and Bros.

Lepley, R. (Ed.) (1957) The language of value. New York: Columbia University Press.

Lerner, M. (1976) Values in education. Bloomington, IL: Phi Delta Kappa.

Park, Y. (1971) Junior college faculty: Their values and perceptions. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Pritchett, B. J. (1973) Values and perceptions of community college professional staff in Oregon. (Doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University) Dissertation Abstracts International, 34A, 1104-A (University Microfilm No. 81-09166, 37)

Pugh, G. E. (1977) The biological origin of human values. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Pullias, E. V., & Young, J. D. (1968) A teacher is many things. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Rescher, N. (1969) Introduction to value theory. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Rokeach, M. (1960) The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Rokeach, M. (1973) The nature of human values. New York: The Free Press.

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges

JUN 2 0 1986